DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 752 UD 027 984

AUTHOR Mulkey, Lynn; And Others
TITLE District 75/Citywide E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B, Institutionalized Facilities Program. Summer 1989. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; Compensatory Education; *Daily Living Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; Institutional Schools; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; *Special Needs Students; Summer Programs; *Supplementary Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Institutionalized Facilities Program NY; *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates a program funded under Chapter 1, Part B, of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act in New York (New York). The New York City Division of Special Education administers the Institutionalized Facilities Program to provide instruction to neglected and delinquent children and adolescents residing in group homes and diagnostic centers. The program was designed to provide these students with vocational and occupational education in basic mathematics, reading, and life skills. For 6 weeks during the summer of 1989, the program staff provided supplementary career education and daily living skills instruction to 422 students residing at 10 sites for the neglected and delinquent. The mandated program objective was that 80 percent of the students would achieve 80 percent of their instructional objectives, as measured by curriculum inventories. Instruction and field trips were to concentrate on career information, job seeking and maintenance behavior, consumerism, personal finance, personal grooming, hygiene, and dressing. Analysis of student performance indicated that 94 percent of the students reached or exceeded the mandated goal, and over 91 percent mastered all of the objectives they attempted. High student transiency levels underscored the importance of individualized instruction. The report presents five recommendations and includes statistical data in four tables. (AF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED330752

OREA Report

DISTRICT 75/CITYWIDE
E.C.I.A. CHAPTER 1, PART B
INSTITUTIONALIZED FACILITIES PROGRAM

SUMMER 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Tobias

NYCAS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 027 984

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISTRICT 75/CITYWIDE
E.C.I.A. CHAPTER 1, PART B
INSTITUTIONALIZED FACILITIES PROGRAM

SUMMER 1989

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING/RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

Robin Willner
Executive Director

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

8/90

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Special Education Evaluation Unit, Ronald C. Miller, Unit Manager of the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) of the New York City Public Schools. Marcia Torres, Evaluation Specialist, was the study manager and William Askins was the Senior Consultant. Data analysis was the responsibility of Arnold Simmel, Project Analyst and Lynn Mulkey, Evaluation Associate. Alma Caraballo helped prepare the quantitative data for analysis. Consultant, Elizabeth Mathias conducted most of the interviews and observations for this study, and Kelli Henry, Consultant, prepared the first draft of the report.

Gaylen Moore edited the report and Donna Manton was responsible for formatting and producing the final draft.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Ronald C. Miller
Special Education Evaluation Unit
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
110 Livingston Street - Room 736
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

District 75/Citywide
E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B
Institutionalized Facilities Program
Summer 89

SUMMARY

- The Chapter 1, Part B, Institutionalized Facilities program was fully implemented. During the 1989 summer session, students received supplementary career education and daily living skills instruction.

- Students not only met, but surpassed the program's achievement objective.

For six weeks during summer 1989, the E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B, Institutionalized Facilities program staff (one coordinator and 17 teachers) provided supplementary career education and daily living skills instruction to 422 students residing in ten sites for the neglected and delinquent.

The program goal was that 80 percent of the students would master 80 percent of their individual short-term objectives. Analysis of student performance on four criterion-referenced tests indicated that 94 percent of the students had reached or surpassed the mastery criterion and that more than 91 percent of students had mastered all of their attempted objectives. Thus, for the third year in a row, the program not only met, but surpassed the student achievement goal. OREA also found that about 69 percent of students had attended ten sessions or less, reflecting the high degree of student transiency and the importance of individualized instruction. Finally, OREA found a strong positive correlation between achievement and attendance ($r = .8175$) supporting the efficacy of program instruction.

The descriptive evaluation of the program, based on visits to sites and interviews with staff, indicated that the program was fully implemented. Teachers used individual, small group, and whole group approaches, and developed instruction to match each student's level of achievement and progress. Specific program strengths were that: ongoing staff development was satisfactory; cooperation between site and agency staff was commendable; teachers used program materials very effectively; program teachers were very enthusiastic; staff members served as positive role models for students; pregnant students had an opportunity to prepare for the arrival of their babies and enhance or continue their education and participate in work-study programs. In general, students could work on developing their academic skills, and participate in physical and recreational activities.

Specific areas that needed improvement were: participants at the site for pregnant students stayed for too short a time to prepare for the life changes that the birth of their babies would entail; students did not visit work sites because transportation was lacking; one site did not have the necessary teaching staff or supplies at the start of the term.

Based on the findings, OREA made the following recommendations for future Institutionalized Facilities summer program cycles.

- Emphasize individualized instruction.

- Emphasize and promote rapport and communication between program and site staff
- Prepare students with special challenges (such as pregnant students) for the major changes in their lives.
- Arrange transportation for students so that work-related site visits can be reinstated.
- Ensure that all sites are fully staffed and have basic supplies from the start of the summer session.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	3
III.	EVALUATION FINDINGS	6
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

TABLE 1: Total Number of Students Served by Each Site 7

TABLE 2: Percent of Objectives Mastered by Students 13

TABLE 3: Number of Skills Mastered by Program Students 14

TABLE 4: Student Attendance 15

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment's (OREA) evaluation of the summer 1989, E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B, Institutionalized Facilities Program. District 75 of the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) designed and administered the program to provide instruction to neglected and delinquent children and adolescents residing in group homes and diagnostic centers. In the summer of 1989, the program was in its twentieth year of implementation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The program was designed to provide vocational and occupational education in basic mathematics, reading, and life skills to neglected and delinquent children and adolescents, such as juvenile offenders in detention centers prior to judicial placement, pregnant teenagers in maternity centers awaiting the birth of their children, and other students residing in public and private residential homes and institutions. The mandated program objective was that 80 percent of the students would achieve 80 percent of their instructional objectives, as measured by curriculum inventories.

The program was to be implemented at ten sites: Atlantic, Baychester, Bunche, Hegeman, Inwood House, MacDougal, Market St., Mt. Loretto, Pius XII, and Good Shepard. Classes were to be scheduled for three hours each day, 9:00 to 12:00 a.m., Monday through Friday, from July 5 to August 15, 1989. Teachers were to provide instruction in three 45-minute sessions each day, utilizing a prescriptive approach based on students' individually diagnosed strengths and weaknesses in occupational education, as measured by curriculum inventories. Instruction and field trips were to concentrate on career information, job seeking and maintenance behavior, consumerism, personal

finance, personal grooming, hygiene, and dressing.

REPORT FORMAT

The report is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the evaluation methodology, Chapter III analyzes and presents the findings, and Chapter IV offers conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the evaluation.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Institutionalized Facilities program was designed to prepare students for their return to society by providing them with academic, vocational, and daily living skills that would enable them to adjust to the outside world and lead independent lives. Besides providing new skills, the program agenda included changing students' attitudes toward school, work, and themselves. OREA evaluated the extent to which the program was implemented as designed, and the extent to which the program met its outcome objectives in the summer of 1989. The program's outcome objectives, as well as OREA's evaluation questions and procedures are presented in this chapter.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

OREA assessed the educational techniques used by teachers, the quality of support provided by agency staff, student mastery of individualized objectives, and student attendance. The evaluation examined the following specific questions:

Program Implementation

- What were the characteristics of participating students?
- What were the characteristics, training activities, and communication patterns of program staff?
- What format, activities, curriculum inventories, materials, and settings were used for instructional purposes?

Program Outcomes

- Did the program meet its mandated objective that 80 percent of the students would achieve 80 percent of their attempted instructional objectives, as measured by the curriculum inventories?

- To what extent was student attendance correlated with achievement?

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Instrumentation

Teachers received OREA-designed student data retrieval forms (D.R.F.s), on which student progress was recorded. OREA designed teacher interview forms for consultants to use during site visits to record teacher perceptions of the program, including general implementation and instructional format, activities, and materials; teachers' rapport with site staff; and recommendations for future program cycles. OREA developed site observation forms to provide a description of the instructional setting, teaching methods, and content.

Sample

The sample of students included all program participants. The program coordinator required that each teacher submit a D.R.F. for each student in the program. In all, OREA collected D.R.F.s for 422 student participants and interviewed 12 out of the 17 teachers at four of the ten sites.

Data Collection

At the end of the program, teachers submitted all student D.R.F.s to the program coordinator, who made a preliminary count and forwarded the data to OREA. OREA field consultants conducted observations and interviewed teachers at each of the program sites in the sample.

Data Analysis

The data analysis consisted of a content analysis of program implementation, and

a quantitative analysis of student characteristics, achievement, and attendance. OREA analyzed student achievement data in order to determine the number of objectives each student had mastered, and the proportion of the sample population that achieved mastery of 80 percent of their objectives as mandated by the program, and to correlate this variable with attendance.

OREA hypothesized that attendance and mastery would be positively correlated. In order to measure this, OREA quantified the number of objectives mastered, and calculated a Pearson's r correlation to estimate the relationship between attendance and achievement. A low correlation between attendance and achievement would indicate that, all else being equal, students were not benefiting from attendance in the program; a high correlation would indicate the alternate hypothesis.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

In this chapter, OREA presents evaluation findings in two sections. Program implementation includes: student and staff characteristics, training and communication patterns, and program strengths and weaknesses. OREA also measured program outcomes, including the extent to which students had met the mandated achievement objective and the effect of attendance on achievement.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Student Characteristics

During the Institutionalized Facilities 1989 summer session, 422 students received instruction. The student population at each institution is presented in Table 1. The average number of students at each site was 42.2; however, actual site populations varied from 12 to 92 students. The average age of students was 14 years old, and of the 408 students whose gender was reported, 234 (57.4 percent) were male, and 174 (42.6 percent) were female. Teachers reported the reason for residency for 261 students. Of these students, neglect was the reported reason for 65.5 percent (171); 12.6 percent (33) were recorded as delinquent; pregnancy was the reason for 9.2 percent (24); and 12.6 percent (33) were recorded as "other."

The length of residency varied greatly: 45.7 percent of the students resided for one month or less; 37.9 percent resided one to six months; 2.8 percent, from six months to one year; and 13.5 percent resided over a year. The trend towards more short-term and fewer long-term residents continued in 1989.

TABLE 1

Total Number of Students Served
by Each Site

(N=422)[a]

Site	STUDENTS	
	Number	Percent
Atlantic Diagnostic Center	74	17.5
Baychester Diagnostic Center	16	3.8
Bunche Diagnostic Center	17	4.0
Hegeman Diagnostic Center	92	21.8
Inwood House	24	5.7
MacDougal	12	2.8
Market Street	27	6.4
Mission Mt. Loretto	84	19.9
Pius XII	62	14.7
Good Shepard	14	3.3

Source: Student data retrieval forms

[a] Includes all students for whom complete achievement information was submitted.

- *Site populations ranged from 12 to 92, with a mean of 42.2.*

Program Staff

Characteristics. The program staff consisted of one program coordinator and 17 teachers. All the teachers were well qualified, with an average of 13 years of teaching experience and nine years in special education. Most teachers had previous experience in the Institutionalized Facilities summer program, averaging over six years.

Training Activities. An initial program staff orientation took place at the beginning of the term, at which presenters discussed the program philosophy and goals, administrative practices, the use of the curriculum inventories, and new materials. All teachers found the orientation "somewhat" or "very" useful, though many of them had received similar training during previous cycles. In spite of the repetition, most found it a good review of program practices.

The program coordinator maintained contact with teachers and staff at the sites, through visits and telephone communication. All teachers commented favorably on the coordinator's ability to be fully informed and available for questions at all times.

Communication With Agency Staff. Agency staff and program teachers maintained contact through regular conferences and informal meetings where they discussed students' behavior, academic progress, motivation, and other needs. At some sites, formal and informal meetings between teachers and agency staff were held regularly, and sometimes daily. Program teachers interacted with a range of agency staff, including directors, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, counsellors, house parents, and other teachers at the sites.

Agency support took a number of forms. At some sites, the agency required that their residents attend program classes. At other sites, staff encouraged students to participate in Institutionalized Facilities summer activities by adjusting schedules or

working with program teachers to develop a system of rewarding students for progress in achievement and attendance. Agency staff also provided materials support, including the use of copying machines, a significant aid in supplying individualized work sheets for students. At some sites, counsellors were posted near the classroom and intervened if any problem occurred. Counsellors also accompanied classes on field trips.

In general, all teachers commended the degree of cooperation established with agency staff. All teachers emphasized that rapport and the exchange of information with agency staff was essential to the success of the program.

Student Instruction

Instructional Activities and Curriculum Inventories. Instructional sessions were held five days a week. Session length ranged from 45 to 180 minutes, depending on the approach used by program teachers.

Program teachers used a variety of instructional approaches to achieve the program's educational goals. Using prepared materials or informal tests, teachers assessed students in order to establish their specific educational needs and appropriate objectives. Lessons were individually developed, and each student's achievement and progress were evaluated. The four curriculum inventories were the primary tools upon which student instruction, assessment, and evaluation were based. These inventories-the *Career Education/Pre-Vocational Skills Assessment Inventory*, the *Activities of Daily Living Skills Assessment Inventory*, the *Specialized Vocational Skills*, the *World of Work*, and the *Law and The Community*-continued to meet teachers' needs.

Teaching approaches included whole class, small group, and individual instruction. Teachers determined which instructional approach to use by considering the size of the

class, student interest and motivation, student schedules, and the ability of the class to work together. At some sites, teachers employed all three methods; at others, the primary approach was whole group or individual instruction.

OREA consultants observed students during classroom activities. In several classes, teachers concentrated on vocational instruction, particularly career choices and job application skills. Law in the community was also stressed. At a site for pregnant teenagers, OREA consultants observed students studying on both academic and clerical skills.

Instructional Materials. Several consultants made note of teachers' effective use of instructional materials. Teachers most frequently reported using audiovisual aids, workbooks, textbooks, arts and crafts, work sheets, storybooks, films, and games. Commercial materials that teachers reported using most frequently in the summer program included: *Life Skills Mathematics* (E.D.I.), *Budgeting* (Lake), *The Law and You* (Follett), *Consumer Buying* (D.L.M.), *Stars* (Turman), *Kalculator Kids* (Good Apple), *Attitudes On The Job* (Educational Design), *Checking Account* (Lake), and *Going Out/Getting Around* (Globe).

Books, audiovisual aides, and supplies were provided by the program. Teachers participated in ordering materials before the start of the program, and forwarded new orders to their program coordinator when the need arose. Most teachers also created some of their own materials, which facilitated the individualization of instruction.

Instructional Setting, Equipment, and Supplies. At most sites, instruction was provided in classrooms or rooms converted for classroom use. All were equipped with blackboards and individual desks. Most classrooms had some or all of the following: storage cabinets, bookshelves, file cabinets, bulletin boards, audiovisual equipment,

plants, maps, posters, and adjacent bathrooms.

Program Strengths

OREA's evaluation reflected the following program strengths: staff training was satisfactory; there was good rapport between program and site staff; site staff was actively supportive of the program; teachers used program materials effectively; overall, program teachers were very enthusiastic; certain program or site staff members (e.g., teachers, house parents, etc.) were very positive role models for students; pregnant students could prepare to have their babies and also develop clerical skills, enhance or continue their education, and participate in work-study programs; students could study in the summer and also participate in physical education and recreational activities such as trips to the country, museum visits, and other activities.

Program Weaknesses

OREA staff were also asked to identify factors that detracted from the program. In previous years, students had traveled by bus to various work sites to enhance their understanding of the work process. However, the bus was eliminated during this term. At one site (for pregnant teenagers), the problem was the short duration of the students' stay and the sudden and radical change that the birth of their babies represented. Another site had no teacher and virtually no supplies at the start of the term.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

Student Achievement

The program objective was that 80 percent of the students would master 80 percent of their short-term instructional objectives. OREA's analysis of program

achievement data showed that 94 percent of the students had reached or exceeded the mandated goal (see Table 2). This was the third year in a row that the summer program exceeded its goal. (Students' performance was 88.5 percent in 1988 and 81.7 percent in 1987.) In 1989, more than 91 percent of the students mastered all of their attempted objectives. This too was a clear improvement over 1988 (82 percent).

The number of objectives mastered by students is presented in Table 3. About 44 percent of the students mastered from 0 to 5 objectives, 75 percent mastered from zero to ten objectives, and over ten percent mastered more than 15 objectives. Overall, students mastered from zero to 25 objectives. Thus, not only did the students as a group meet and surpass the mandated goal, but also many individual students surpassed the number of objectives set as a minimum level of performance.

Student Attendance

OREA recorded the range of student attendance (See Table 4). About 45 percent of students (N=182) attended five sessions or less, about 69 percent attended ten sessions or less, only 8.2 percent attended 26 to 30 sessions, and about 11 percent attended more than 20 sessions. These results as well as those of recent program cycles continue to reflect a trend toward many more short-term residents, and emphasizes the need for the program to maintain a flexible, individualized approach to instruction.

Attendance/Achievement Correlation

To evaluate the effect of attendance on mastery, OREA calculated a Pearson's r correlation statistic to measure the relationship between mastery and student attendance. In 1989, there was a high degree of correlation, a Pearson's r of .8175 (N=401). This figure indicates that there is a strong relationship between attendance and achievement.

TABLE 2

Percent of Objectives Mastered
by Students

(N=412)[a]

Percent of Objectives Mastered	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Percent
100	376	91.3	91.3
90-99	4	1.0	92.3
80-89	7	1.7	94.0
60-79	2	0.5	94.5
1-59	15	3.6	98.1
0	8	1.9	100.0

Source: Student data retrieval forms

[a]Includes all students for whom complete achievement information was submitted.

- *Ninety-four percent (387) of the students mastered 80 percent or more of their objectives.*
- *Over 91 percent (376) of the students mastered all of their attempted objectives.*

TABLE 3

Number of Skills Mastered
by Program Students

(N=411)[a]

Number of Skills Mastered	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Percent
21-25	13	3.2	3.2
16-20	29	7.1	10.3
11-15	61	14.8	25.1
6-10	125	30.4	55.5
1-5	167	40.6	96.1
0	16	3.9	100.0

Source: Student data retrieval forms

[a]Includes all students for whom complete achievement information was submitted.

- *About 44 percent of students mastered five or fewer objectives.*
- *Seventy-five percent of students mastered ten or fewer objectives.*
- *Over 10 percent of the students mastered more than 15 objectives.*

TABLE 4

Student Attendance

(N = 401)

Number of Sessions	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Percent
26-30	33	8.2	8.2
21-25	11	2.7	10.9
16-20	20	5.0	15.9
11-15	60	15.0	30.9
6-10	95	23.7	54.6
0- 5	182	45.4	100.0

Source: Student data retrieval forms

[a]Data for 21 students were missing.

- *About 45 percent of the students attended five or fewer sessions; about 69 percent attended ten or fewer sessions.*
- *About 8.2 percent of students attended over 25 sessions.*

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1989 E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B Institutionalized Facilities Summer program provided effective prevocational, supplementary vocational, supplementary academic, and activities of daily living skills instruction to 422 residents of institutions for the neglected and delinquent, whose length of residency varied greatly and tended to be short-term.

OREA's analysis of program implementation data, which used four curriculum inventories, showed that teachers developed instruction to match each student's level of achievement and progress. Teaching approaches included whole class, small group, and individual instruction. At most sites, instruction was provided in classrooms or rooms converted for classroom use.

OREA's evaluation reflected the following program strengths: ongoing staff development was satisfactory; cooperation between site and agency staff was commendable and was considered essential to the success of the program; and teachers used program materials very effectively. In general, program teachers were very enthusiastic; certain staff members served as very positive role models for students. Pregnant students had an opportunity to prepare for the arrival of their babies and enhance or continue their education, or participate in work-study programs. The program gave students the opportunity to work on developing their academic skills and participate in physical and recreational activities.

OREA's evaluation reflected the following program weaknesses: participants at the site for pregnant teenagers stayed too short a time to prepare for the life changes that the birth of their babies would entail. Students at some sites did not visit work sites because transportation was lacking; and one of the sites did not have the necessary teaching staff

or supplies at the start of the term.

OREA's analysis of program achievement data showed that 94 percent of the students reached or exceeded the mandated goal. Over 91 percent of students mastered all the objectives they attempted. It was the third year in a row that the summer program exceeded its goal. OREA's analysis of attendance data showed that about 69 percent of the students attended ten sessions or less. This figure indicates the high degree of student transiency, and emphasizes the importance of an individualized instructional approach. OREA also found a strong positive correlation between achievement and attendance ($r = .8175$).

Based on the findings of this evaluation, OREA makes the following recommendations for future Institutionalized Facilities summer program cycles.

- Emphasize individualized instruction.
- Emphasize and promote rapport and communication between program and site staff.
- Prepare students with special challenges (such as pregnant teenagers) for the major changes in their lives.
- Arrange transportation for students so that work-related site visits can be reinstated.
- Ensure that all sites are fully staffed and have basic supplies from the start of the program.